



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Müller :

Mag allein der Geizhals fasten
Neben dem gefüllten Kasten :
Ich bin nicht gern allein
Mit meinem Glase Wein.

A final correspondence between the two songs lies in the boy whom in each case the poet despatches on his errand.

Opitz :

Hola, Junge, geh' und frage.

Müller :

Knäblein, klag' im Mondenscheine.

The thief (stanza 1), the monk (st. 3), and the dyspeptic (st. 5), are a further development of the theme occurring only in Müller; as is *die Holde* (st. 4), whoever she may be: the allusion not being clear from the context.

The refrain with which each stanza of Müller begins and closes :

Ich bin nicht gern allein
Mit meinem Glase Wein

may well be a reminiscence of the similar lines contained in the closing stanza of the widely-sung Volkslied, *Die Gedanken sind frei* :

Ich bin nicht alleine
Bei meinem Glas Weine—

which verses, although they were omitted from the song as printed in the first edition of the *Wunderhorn*,⁵ occur in practically every version of the *Volkslied* which has since been published.⁶

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

University of Chicago.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

A History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century. By HENRY A. BEERS. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1899. 8vo, pp. v, 455.

The French Revolution and the English Poets.

A Study in Historical Criticism. By ALBERT ELMER HANCOCK, Ph.D. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1899. 8vo, pp. xvi, 195.

WITH the appearance of each new book on English romanticism we seem to drift farther

5 iii, 1808, p. 38.

6 For example, Hoffmann u. Richter, *Schlesische Volkslieder*, Leipzig, 1842, p. 307; Mittler, *Deutsche Volkslieder*, second ed., Frankfurt a. M., 1865, p. 660; Erk, *Deutscher Liederhort*, Berlin, 1856, p. 358; Menzel, *Die Gesänge der Völker*, Leipzig, 1866, p. 116; Simrock, *Die Deutschen Volkslieder*, Frankfurt a. M., 1857, no. 360; Mündel, *Elsässische Volkslieder*, Strassburg, 1884, p. 277; Wolfram, *Nassauische Volkslieder*, Berlin, 1894, p. 351; Becker, *Rheinischer Volksliederborn*, Neuwied a. Rh., [1892], p. 49; etc.

and farther away from an adequate definition of the term, if not from a clearer conception of the literary features of the movement. The two best and most recent books on the "Romantic Movement" in England begin with an enumeration of the many attempts at, and of the almost insuperable difficulties attending, a sufficiently comprehensive definition.

"Any attempt," says Phelps,¹ "to make a definition of romanticism that will be at once specific and adequate is sure to result in failure. It is not simply that the word 'Romantic' has both a popular and a critical sense, each of which differs widely from the other, but that the word is used critically in very different ways."

After devoting almost four pages to difficulties and definitions (chiefly from German and French critics), Phelps, without attempting a specific definition of romanticism, says (p. 4) :

"Romantic literature will generally be found to show three qualities: Subjectivity, Love of the Picturesque, and a Reactionary spirit."

Likewise Beers² thinks that "to attempt at the outset a rigid definition of the word *romanticism* would be" a hopeless task:

"There are words which connote so much, which take up into themselves so much of the history of the human mind, that any compendious explanation of their meaning—any definition which is not, at the same time, a rather extended description—must serve little other end than to supply a convenient mark of identification . . . Nevertheless a rough, working definition may be useful to start with. Romanticism, then, in the sense in which I shall commonly employ the word, means the reproduction in modern art or literature of the life and thought of the Middle Ages."

Now, the definitions and general methods of treatment of the two excellent books above mentioned are too narrow in compass, because they start from the wrong standpoint. A definition which might apply to French or German romanticism would fall far short if applied to the Romantic movement in England. The word *romanticism* "connotes" much more as it is employed in England, than in either France or Germany. For this reason such definitions as those of Heine,³

¹ *The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement.* By William Lyon Phelps. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1893, p. 1.

² *English Romanticism*, pp. 1-2.

³ *Die Romantische Schule*, p. 158.

"Was war aber die romantische Schule in Deutschland? Sie war nichts anders als die Wiedererweckung der Poesie des Mittelalters, wie sie sich in dessen Liedern, Bild- und Bauwerken, in Kunst und Leben, manifestiert hatte;"

and of Madame de Staël,⁴

"Le nom de romantique a été introduit nouvellement en Allemagne, pour désigner la poésie . . . qui est née de la chevalerie et du christianisme,"

are very inadequate when applied to English romanticism of the eighteenth century.

In England the literary revival of the eighteenth century, whose beginnings are described with so much interest and *verve* in Prof. Beers' book, was too intimately associated with the revolution in politics, philosophy and religion, to be thoroughly comprehended as a purely literary movement. There is not a single phase of the social life of England in the eighteenth century that is not reflected in its literature. Foreign wars and policies, colonial settlements, "South Sea Bubbles," criminal excesses at home, landscape gardening, the beginnings of modern music and painting, the revival of architecture, the revolt against materialism in philosophy and rationalism in religion, all contributed their quotas toward the romantic revival. I think one would be justified in the assertion that in the last half of the century, more than in any previous period, English literature was "the reflection and the reproduction of the life of the people."

But the literary revival was only one of the symptoms of the romantic rash which broke out in England in the eighteenth century. No physician can properly diagnose a complicated disease by studying ever so carefully one or two of a half dozen equally important symptoms. No critical study, however thorough, of the purely literary side of eighteenth century romanticism can be sufficiently comprehensive and satisfactory. The revival in literature which we call "romanticism" (in the narrower sense) is one of the many manifestations of the spirit of universal revolt against seventeenth and early eighteenth century standards of social life. This spirit of unrest did not originate in literature. It did not even make its appearance in

aesthetic English literature until long after it had permeated politics, religion, and philosophy. In fact Romanticism broke out in literature when society had become so thoroughly saturated with the spirit of revival that it was impossible to arrest it. What are the first rays of sentimentality which begin to warm up the cold formalism of the poetry of Young, Hervey, Blair, Shenstone, Akenside, and, to some extent, of Gray and Collins, but the reflection of the sentimental outburst in religion under the Wesleys, Whitefield, Doddridge, and others? We know that this "emotionalism" in religion was simply a reaction from the theological rationalism of the seventeenth century, tempered and refined by the mysticism of Law and the idealism of Berkeley and Hume,—so far as the first gushes of emotionalism were tempered and refined. Moreover, if we look closely, examine the history of the period carefully, we shall find that the rise of the sentimental novel, Richardson's *Pamela*, *Clarissa Harlowe*, and the rest, was due more to the sentimental revival in religion and morals, than to any pre-existent literary conditions in England or on the Continent.

I believe that a careful consideration of the beginnings of the poetic revival in England in its relations to contemporaneous theology and philosophy will convince any one that the revival of the Spenserian stanza, and of the Miltonic verse and melancholy of *Penseroso*, were not *causes* in themselves. They were merely the concomitants of the newly resurrected spirit of sentimentality which was gradually making its entry into English literature. These forms were employed by the forerunners of the romantic movement because they had been employed by the greatest poets of sentiment in the past, and because the Heroic Couplet as "perfected" by Pope was too rational and intellectual, too "exact," for the expression of the softer, gentler emotions of the poetic soul. In other words, the revival of Spenser and Milton, of landscape poetry and the Gothic spirit, by the English poets of the second quarter of the eighteenth century, were rather manifestations of the universal spirit of unrest, than exciting causes of a later literary upheaval.

To return to the question of definition, I re-

⁴ *De l'Allemagne*, Vol. i, Chap. xxx. Cf. Phelps, p. 2.

peat it is wholly inadequate to a clear comprehension of the subject to define (English) romanticism as "the reproduction in modern art or literature of the life and thought of the Middle Ages." Such a definition might apply to the romantic revival in France or Germany, and, as was noticed above, it was at first enunciated as the specific definition of German romanticism. So it seems to me a fundamental defect of what most English and American writers have said on romanticism, that it has been too largely colored by what previous French and German critics have written on the same subject.

Suppose we apply Prof. Beers' version of Heine's definition to English poetry beginning about the year 1800. How much of modern English literature could be claimed for romanticism? The most of Coleridge and Scott, and some of Byron and Moore; while all of Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, Landor, and a great deal of Byron would be excluded. But Wordsworth, Byron, Shelley, and Keats were much more at variance with the existing order of things, much more revolutionary, much more romantic (in the true and broad sense) than Scott, or even Coleridge.

After all the quibbling with sonorous and inadequate phraseology, one is more and more inclined to see in the expression, "the return to Nature," in its broadest application, the essentials of an adequate definition of romanticism.

"The 'return to Nature,'" says Leslie Stephen, "expresses a sentiment which underlies to some extent both the sentimental and the romantic movements, and which was more distinctly embodied in writers of a higher order. To return to nature is, in one sense, to find a new expression for emotions which have been repressed by existing conventions; or, in another, to return to some simpler social order which had not yet suffered from those conventions. The artificiality attributed to the eighteenth century seems to mean that men were content to regulate their thoughts and lives by rules not traceable to first principles, but dependent upon a set of special and exceptional conditions; and, again, that in the imaginative sphere the accepted symbols did not express the deepest and most permanent emotions, but were an arbitrary compromise between tradi-

tional assumptions and the new philosophical tenets."

Prof. Herford, in a clear and concise description of romanticism,⁶ says, among other things, in reply to the question:

"What was Romanticism? Primarily it was an extraordinary development of imaginative sensibility. At countless points the universe of sense and thought acquired a new potency of response and appeal to man, a new capacity of ministering to, and mingling with his richest and intensest life. Glory of lake and mountain, grace of childhood, dignity of the untaught peasant, wonder of fairy, mystery of the Gothic aisle, radiance,—all these springs of the poet's inspiration and the artist's joy began to flow, not at once but in prolonged unordered succession.

The word Romance, hackneyed and vulgarized as it is, expresses less inadequately than any other the kind of charm which these heterogeneous sources of poetry exercised in common. They were all, to begin with *strange*; ways of escape from the pressure of the ordinary, modes of deliverance from the dead weight of routine. But the romance of which poetry is begotten can never be merely strange. It has a subtler fascination, which rests partly upon wonder, but partly also upon recognition. For its peculiar quality lies in this, that in apparently detaching us from the real world it seems to restore us to reality at a higher point, to emancipate us from the 'prison of the actual,' by giving us spiritual rights in a universe of the mind, exempt from the limitations of matter, and time, and space, but appealing at countless points to the instinct for that which endures and subsists. To rekindle the soul of the past, or to reveal a soul where no eye had yet discerned it; to call up Helen or Isolde, or to invest lake and mountain with 'the light that never was on sea or shore'; to make the natural appear supernatural, as Wordsworth and Coleridge put it, or the supernatural natural,—were but different avenues to the world of Romance . . . Romanticism, beyond all other literary movements, is impregnated with speculative elements: its poets are teachers and prophets, ardent reformers, philosophic reactionaries, innovators in religion, or in criticism, or in history. '*Le romantisme*,' as M. Lanson says, '*et c'est là sa grandeur*' est tout traversé de frissons métaphysiques; and metaphysic, on its part, was penetrated with the instincts of romanticism."

This analytic definition of Prof. Herford is certainly more comprehensive than any that has been given so far; and the discussion shows

⁵ *English thought in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. ii, p. 437.

⁶ *The Age of Wordsworth. Introduction*, pp. xiv-xv. By C. H. Herford, Litt. D. London: George Bell and Sons, 1897.

that the author appreciates the breadth and depth of the romantic movement.

Hancock⁷ labors under difficulties similar to those of Phelps and Beers: he misapplies the term "Romantic Movement." He attempts to define it as a literary movement, but he seems to feel at the same time that his definition is inadequate.

"The Romantic Movement," he says (p. 43), "is the term applied to a certain historic commotion in the world of literature; it ran a course, if one must give dates, of three score years and ten, and its middle point was the first year of the nineteenth century. It was only one phase of a general commotion; there were correspondent and sympathetic movements in social, political, religious, and philosophical fields. The literary agitation began, as Prof. Phelps' admirable and comprehensive study has shown, amid the regular and decorous chants of the pseudo-classic poets, as a feeble echo of the strains and themes of Shakspeare, Spenser, Milton, and a Gothic past. . . . The term Romantic was applied to the new writers; largely because the prosaic men of the previous age disliked anything that savored of romance, and many of the new poets wrote upon themes which offended common sense and conventionality. The Romantic Movement, however, is an unfortunate phrase. No satisfactory definition can be given which will include all the facts."

When Hancock states further (p. 45-6):

"The Romantic Movement was an unconscious revolt against these (that is of the eighteenth century) literary standards. . . . The Romantic Movement was a protest against the tyranny of the type,"

he seems to feel that he has expressed only a half truth; that it was not the revolt of the *literary* standard of one century against that of the other, but rather the revolt of the social standards of one century against the social standards of the preceding. Literature was only the expression of the different phases of this complex social life. Therefore, he hastens to modify the assertion:

"It was a declaration of the rights of the individual to be normal or abnormal. Romanticism declared that the best in life was not found among state centres of civilization, but on the frontiers, where there was less convention, less order, less artifice, where the human spirit might range as wit and fancy willed."

The social revolt of the later eighteenth

century manifested itself chiefly in three different, but intimately associated ways, all of which seem to me to emanate from the strong desire to return to Nature. In the first place there was a political manifestation: a revolt against the tyranny and oppression of preceding ages; a longing for simplicity, naturalness in government. This was accompanied by a revival of national spirit, which was in turn the leading incentive toward the study of the models of the past. This study was of necessity partly literary. Secondly, the revolt was philosophical: a revolt against materialism and rationalism, resulting in idealism and emotionalism. Thirdly, the revolt was purely literary: a revolt against the formalism and lifelessness of the age of Pope. The reaction expressed itself in a return to nature in the narrower, more literal sense. Poets began to go to nature for their inspiration. The description of natural scenery became a ruling passion in poetry. Man and his moods were projected upon the canvas of nature, where a panacea for mental and moral ills was thought to inhere.

Considered from the narrower, purely literary standpoint, Prof. Beers' *English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century* is a valuable contribution to the history of English literature. The materials are arranged in eleven chapters, and the literary revolt is traced from its rather indefinite beginnings through the period of Thomas Chatterton. The chapters on "The Spenserians," "The Landscape Poets," "The Miltonic Group," "Percy and the Ballads," and "Thomas Chatterton," are handled in a thorough and masterly manner, and leave little more to be said or desired on the respective subjects. We might, perhaps, have wished that the author were less verbose, did he not evince such knowledge of the whole subject, and were his verbosity not so entertaining.

I have already dwelt at length on the contents of Chap. i, *The Subject Defined*, and time and space will permit only a few observations on Chap. ix, *Ossian*, and the final chapter, *The German Tributary*.

The discussions on MacPherson and his *Ossian*, while written in an entertaining style, and while furnishing an excellent résumé of Ossianic criticism from its beginning to the present time, are very unsatisfactory. The author is

⁷ *French Revolution and English Poets*, pp. 43 et seq.

here not master of his subject, to the extent that some of the best and most recent criticism has escaped him altogether. What he says, and the conclusions he reaches, are what has been said, and conclusions that have been reached, over and over again during the past one hundred years. After reading the chapter we know little, if any thing, more about Mac Pherson and his mysterious relations to the Ossianic poems than was known in 1805, after *The Report of the Committee of the Highland Society* was published. And we are not quite sure that Prof. Beers does not still consider Mac Pherson a literary cheat and forger.

While I am not prepared to say that Mac Pherson did not tamper with his originals, to the extent of frequently filling up gaps with words and lines, it seems to me that any one who has read Bailey Saunders⁸ life of MacPherson (and it is one of the best, most unbiased, most authoritatively written, biographies that I have read), will conclude that he was any thing but a conscious forger. Saunders has given an insight into the character, into the literary and political ambitions, of MacPherson which enables us to understand and appreciate his mysterious action in reference to the Ossianic poems, and his peculiar attitude of indifference to the hostile criticism of the day.

The following points, the majority of which have been noted in some manner by Ossianic criticism of the last fifty years, and which are, of course, considered in Prof. Beers' chapter on Ossian, are emphasized by Saunders :

1. MacPherson's tastes in literature were from the beginning wholly classical. This is evidenced by all his efforts at original composition. The Romantic vein was unpopular with the literary public of both England and Scotland. It is not at all probable, therefore, that MacPherson was desirous of risking his hopes for literary fame in the unthankful task of collecting and translating Gaelic fragments.

2. His reluctance in undertaking the work of translating the *Fragments*, and more especially their publication in 1760; his disinclination to give up his position as tutor in a

⁸ *The Life and Letters of James MacPherson. Containing a particular Account of his famous Quarrel with Dr. Johnson, and a Sketch of the Origin and Influence of the Ossianic Poems.* By Bailey Saunders. London: 1894.

wealthy family, and to devote months of his time in searching the Highlands and the Hebrides for other manuscripts and fragments, must be considered as genuine and not feigned.

3. That he did make *bona fide* collections, partly in manuscripts which he found among the inhabitants of the Highlands, Skye, and the Hebrides, partly in writing down with his own hand poems which were recited to him from time to time by the Gaelic peasantry, is beyond all doubt. This is established by so much and such strong testimony in the way of letters, written and oral statements, made for the most part by reliable and disinterested persons, that it is folly to attempt to prove the contrary.

4. The *Fragments* when they first appeared raised scarcely a suspicion of forgery in England. In preparing the translation of the materials collected on his "first journey," Mac Pherson was in continual intercourse with Dr. Hugh Blair, and worked to some extent under his direction. It was Blair's, not MacPherson's, original idea that the fragments were part of a great epic, *Fingal*.

5. MacPherson was neither a Gaelic scholar, nor was he acquainted with antiquities: it was, therefore, quite natural that so profound a scholar as Gray should be disgusted with his ignorant attempts at explaining the origin of the fragments. The popularity of the first published *Fragments* turned his head, and caused him to assume airs and pose before the literary world.

6. MacPherson's method of arranging the *Fingal* fragments is to be condemned. It was, however, the same method which was followed to some extent by Percy in publishing the *Reliques*. It was also a method suggested and sanctioned by Blair. Beyond a doubt, he added lines (just to what extent will probably never be known)⁹ now and then for the purpose of making the fragments appear as a connected whole. He doubtless used the filing process also with his originals whenever he felt it necessary.

7. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that large parts of both *Fingal* and *Temora* were

⁹ On this point cf. Ludwig Chr. Stern's *Die Ossianischen Heldenlieder*, *Zeitschrift für vergl. Literaturgesch.* (n. f.), vol. viii, 51-86 and 143-174.

what they claimed to be: translations (frequently very free) from Gaelic originals.

8 Saunders shows conclusively that MacPherson really intended at one time to publish the "originals." He was hindered from carrying out this intention at first by the lack of funds necessary to defray the expenses of such a vast undertaking: the first attempt at publication by subscription in London failed completely. When later the £1000 was subscribed for the purpose, MacPherson's time and energy were entirely employed in writing political pamphlets, and otherwise advancing the interests of the Tory government. He became deeply interested in politics—especially Indian affairs, was elected to Parliament, etc. Moreover, bitter criticism arising from ignorance and prejudice—like that of Dr. Johnson—MacPherson considered beneath his notice. So much of this kind of criticism coupled with his sensitive, haughty disposition finally made him careless of all criticism, therefore he obstinately refused to answer the charges of forgery which were made against him.

9. When Dr. Johnson became so bitterly personal in his criticism, MacPherson, at the instance of his publisher, did exert himself to some extent to silence the old Doctor's unreasonable blusterings. He did most certainly place the originals—or certain originals—of his *Ossian* in the hands of his London publisher, Thomas Beckett, where they could have been seen and examined by any one interested in the subject. Beckett advertised the fact that the originals were in his possession and, at the same time, repeated the proposal for printing them. This is attested by a letter from Beckett "To the Public" in January, 1775,—not "more *Fingal* and *Temora*, as Prof. Beers states, p. 320, but just about the time that "Dr. Johnson was calling loudly for the manuscript." Beckett's letter was as follows:

"TO THE PUBLIC.

DOCTOR JOHNSON having asserted in his late publication that the TRANSLATOR OF *OSSIAN'S* POEMS 'never could show the original, nor can it be shown by any other,' I hereby declare that the originals of *Fingal* and other poems of *Ossian* lay in my shop for many months in the year 1762, for inspection of the curious. The

public were not only apprised of their lying there for inspection, but even proposals for publishing the originals of the poems of *Ossian* were dispersed through the kingdom, and advertised in the newspapers. Upon finding that a number of subscribers sufficient to bear the expenses were not likely to appear, I returned the manuscripts to the proprietor, in whose hands they still remain.

Thomas Beckett.

Adelphi, 19th January, 1775."¹⁰

It is, therefore, clear that MacPherson made an earnest effort both to produce and to publish the originals of his "*Fingal* and other poems," if any trust may be placed in the signed statement of the agent through whom the attempts were made. If Prof. Beers had been familiar with Saunders' history of James MacPherson's life and the *Ossianic* poems, his chapter on *Ossian* would, I am sure, have assumed a very different tone, and he would have reached much more definite conclusions on MacPherson and his great work.¹¹

Prof. Beers does not give a sufficiently adequate idea of the influence of *Ossian* upon the literature of English romanticism. He thinks that Wordsworth's assertion that *Ossian* failed to

" 'amalgamate with the literature of the island' needs some qualification. That it did not enter into English literature in a formative way as Percy's ballads is true enough, and is easy of explanation" (p. 326). Again, he says (pp. 327-8): "The impression was temporary, but it was immediate and powerful,"

and this is not sufficiently strong. B. Schnabel¹² has shown by a careful examination of the influence of *Ossian* in England from 1760 until 1830, that every poet of note during this long period was indebted, to a greater or less extent, to the Celtic bard. Very few years passed by from 1760 to 1819, each of which did not produce one or more metrical versions, dramatizations, or imitations of *Ossian*.

Much new light on "The German Tributary" to the English romantic movement, and upon the literary importance of William Taylor of

¹⁰ Cf. *Notes and Queries*, II, iii, 28.

¹¹ Saunders' book is reviewed at length in both the *Athenaeum* and the *Academy* for 1895.

¹² *Ossian in der schönen Litteratur Englands bis 1830*, *Englische Studien* xxiii, 31-73, and 366-401.

Norwich, is to be found in Herzfeld's recent monograph.¹³

Hancock's *French Revolution and the English Poets* is to some extent a continuation of Beers' *English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century*. That is to say, Hancock's book contains a series of thorough studies of the influence of the French Revolution upon the poetry of four of the greatest of the English romanticists; namely, Shelley, Byron, Wordsworth, and Coleridge. The first two essays, those on Shelley and Byron, are admirably done. No one¹⁴ has before shown so clearly the part which the French Revolution and French philosophy played in the composition of *Queen Mab*; and how Shelley in later years, just as Wordsworth, recoiled from his youthful vagaries.

The essay on Byron is almost better than that on Shelley: it is written in such a sympathetic, appreciative vein. All of us have some vague ideas of Byron's love of freedom, and the conception of freedom in his poems, but Hancock has traced the growth of these ideas, as they appear in Byron's poetry, under the impulse of the Revolution. We see and appreciate this side of Byron's and Shelley's poetry as never before.

The same is true of the studies of Wordsworth and Coleridge, who, being more moderate revolutionists and less permeated with the spirit of the Revolution, are considered after Shelley and Byron, in violation of the chronological order. The author shows in a strikingly clear manner how Wordsworth, under the influence of William Godwin and French philosophy, was slowly "invalidating

his early faith in the spirit," and was virtually casting himself upon "the shallows of agnosticism," when his sister Dorothy comes upon the scene of action, and leads the poet back to the haunts of his childhood. Here, in communion with the spirit of nature, and away from the philosophy and the error of the Revolution, away from "the logical debates of the city," he is gradually won back to the faith and "experiences of his youth."

And what lasting good did Wordsworth gain from his passion for the French Revolution? "It humanized him." After his long sojourn in France "the interest in man, in human affairs, became the supreme centre of his thoughts."

Hancock's work contains an introduction on "Historical Criticism" by Prof. Lewis E. Gates, and Part I (chapters i-iii) treats of the *Principles of the French Revolution*. Chapters ii and iii are devoted to a brief explanation of the philosophical systems of Helvetius, Holbach, Rousseau and William Godwin. Chapter i might have been omitted without injury to the unity of the book, since here, and frequently throughout Part I, the author is tediously and uselessly verbose. In fact the reader will be more likely to become interested in, and appreciate the book by commencing with the essay on Shelley. The first chapter of Part II, *The Romantic Movement*, is interesting, but there is entirely too much repetition of the same idea in slightly different words. A brief bibliography would, it seems to me, have added greatly to the value of the book.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

¹³ William Taylor von Norwich. *Eine Studie über den Einfluss der neueren deutschen Litteratur in England*, von Georg Herzfeld. Halle: Niemeyer, 1897.

¹⁴ Of course the influence of the French Revolution on English literature has frequently received consideration by critics and literary historians,—and notably by Prof. Dowden. But the studies have all been of a general character. Even in his recently published *Princeton Lectures* Prof. Dowden is far from treating the poets of the Revolutionary period in the specific manner of Dr. Hancock's book. And Prof. Dowden has not, it seems to me, in his discussions forestalled, or rendered less valuable, these careful studies of Hancock. On the contrary Hancock's essays are valuable supplements to the broader more general treatment of Prof. Dowden, as well as of that of Brandes in the fifth edition (1897) of his *Der Naturalismus in England*.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Euphoriion, Zeitschrift für Litteraturgeschichte, herausgegeben von AUGUST SAUER. Fünfter Band, 1898.

EUPHORIION calls itself a journal for literary history. In point of fact it is a journal for the literary history of Germany since the Reformation, and for this comparatively narrow and yet really inexhaustible field of study, the quarterly has already, in the five years of its existence, made itself a necessity, as well for its articles and its publication of the briefer in-